



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ports purporting to emanate from authentic sources. From these I stated a treaty had been tentatively agreed upon which in effect repealed the California alien land laws.

The Secretary of State says in substance this is not so. Either the press reports are erroneous or Mr. Colby is misinformed. I am constrained to believe that Mr. Colby is in error.

But a controversy between the Secretary of State and myself as to what is contained in the report of Ambassador Morris is of no consequence. The contents of the report are all-important. Mr. Colby has the report. The people of the West, to whom this subject is of paramount importance, are entitled to know what that report contains.

Yesterday it was discussed at length in Japan. Our people should not have to await its details through Japanese news channels. It is not sufficient that the representatives from California or the Foreign Relations Committee, under a promise of secrecy, should finally know what disposition is intended to be made of the agricultural lands of California and other Western States. The people of these Western States are entitled to know it, and entitled to know it now.

The grave question here is not whether I am right in saying that a treaty has been presented which in effect repeals our alien land laws, or whether Mr. Colby is right in saying that no such draft of a treaty has been presented. The matter is far beyond any personal controversy. The question is, What has been done on the subject in which the West is most interested and which most intimately concerns the West's future? And the West should be told forthwith.

JAPAN AND THE ISLAND OF YAP

Friction between the United States and Japan exists over exclusive authority claimed by Japan over the Island of Yap, in the North Pacific, under mandate terms laid down by the Treaty of Versailles and by supplementary rulings of the Supreme Council. It is the contention of the State Department that, though without documentary evidence of the fact and formal recognition of the same, President Wilson at the Paris Conference stipulated that this island, with its ganglion of cable connections, should not become an exclusive possession under a mandate of the League, but should be a mutual possession and so administered with respect to intercommunication of news. This issue became acute at the first session of the International Communications' Conference, held in Washington this autumn and winter, and it will be one of the first items on the agenda when the conference reconvenes, the European delegates having for a time been at home consulting with their home governments on this and other disputed issues which the prolonged debate caused. Any disposition of Japan or any other powers to stand out against a maximum of internationalization of the process of interchange of news throughout the world is to be stoutly fought by the United States, and in this attitude the Department of State has the support of the present congressional committees of Foreign Affairs, and the position will have similar backing in the coming Congress under the new administration. Japan, challenging this broad policy or showing a disposition to stand on any technicality in combatting the claim of the United States as to the agreement made at Paris, would not better her relations with the United States.

A SENATE MOVE FOR INFORMATION

On February 7 the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate intimated to the Department of State a desire to see the text of an agreement between the United States and Japan, informally but laboriously worked out during many weeks of negotiations between the ambassadors of the two

countries sitting in Washington. This proposed compact was submitted to Secretary Colby on his return from South America, but at this writing it is not known that it has met with his or with the President's approval; and there are indications that the whole problem will pass to the next Administration for solution. The Senate's committee in asking for a chance to understand the terms of the proposed treaty did so with larger national problems in mind, those affecting American interests in the Far East and the necessities of naval construction.

RUSSIA, ARMENIA, AND THE UNITED STATES

On January 23 Ludwig C. A. K. Martens, unrecognized "ambassador" to the United States from Soviet Russia, sailed from New York for a Baltic port, having been formally deported by order of the government. With him were his large staff of secretaries, and also a group of Russian Communists, also undergoing deportation. His departure was the occasion of a demonstration by American sympathizers, and ere he sailed he made public a formal statement to the American people. From it we quote:

I think that America has made a mistake in declining to trade with Russia, and England speedily will take advantage of that fact to do business with the Soviet Government.

In taking leave of the United States I wish to say a word of grateful appreciation for the personal kindness and courtesy which I have received from many Americans in all vocations throughout the country. It has been a source of constant encouragement to me to find everywhere men and women who have not allowed hysterical fears or prejudices to move them from their sympathy with the cause which I have represented.

My departure has come as the logical and inevitable consequence of the policy of the American Government toward Soviet Russia. So long as that policy was not declared, so long as I could not secure from any responsible official any frank expression of that policy, my government was justified in keeping me here to strive for the establishment of normal political and economic relations between the United States and Soviet Russia.

I have no knowledge of the future plans of the American Government, nor can I tell in what direction this policy of ignoring the existence of the established government of the largest country in Europe will lead. I know that the Soviet Government is more firmly established, beyond fear or danger of foreign or internal assault, than it was on the day when I first approached the American Government on its behalf. I know, further, that the industrial and economic conditions of the world, not excepting America, are such that the resumption of normal economic relations with Russia has become an imperative necessity upon all nations. I can only say that when the American people are prepared to approach this problem the government of the Russian workers and peasants will be ready to meet them in a reasonable and friendly spirit.

SECRETARY WILSON'S LETTER

An interesting addendum to the literature of this controversy is a letter sent by Secretary of Labor Wilson to the counsel of Mr. Martens, from which the following quotation is made:

In the evidence presented to me in the Martens case it was clearly shown that a group of men calling themselves Communists had set up a military dictatorship in Russia; that they had camouflaged it under the name of a dictatorship of the proletariat, seeking to convey the impression that it was a dictatorship by the proletariat; that it had by force of arms introduced compulsory labor—in other words,

slavery—into Russia; that the proletariat were compelled to work at occupations selected for them at meager wages and long hours, imposed under the direction of the military masters.

Naturally the sympathy of the administration and of the American people, including the workers, goes out to the Russian people under such circumstances, just as our sympathies go out to the oppressed of all lands, no matter who or what the oppressor may be. But these things did not bring Martens within the jurisdiction of the Department of Labor. The evidence was cumulative and conclusive that the military dictatorship of Russia, calling itself the Soviet Government, was appropriating large sums of money to stir up insurrection by force of arms against the United States Government.

It is a novel principle in international law, and one that is not likely to be generally accepted, that a newly established military dictatorship in one country may capitalize the traditional friendship of another country for its people by making a pretense of wanting to establish friendly relations with the government at the same time that it is seeking to destroy it by stirring up insurrection. As long as that attitude is maintained by any group in Russia, whether it temporarily dominates that country by force of arms or not, members of its organization, residents in but alien to the United States, will be subject to the deportation laws administered by the Department of Labor.

Our government is a people's government. Its basic law can be changed whenever the people desire it to be changed, by peaceful parliamentary processes. It can be made as radical as any one may desire whenever a sufficient number of our people are convinced that radicalism is the kind of government we need, and by the same process it can respond to the needs of conservatism. Yet this is the government that the Soviet group in Russia seek to overthrow through the fighting force of an aggressive minority which they hope to pit against a passive majority.

I have taken pains on various occasions to point out that there is nothing in our immigration law that requires the deportation of any alien because he believes in, teaches, or advocates socialism, communism, syndicalism, a Soviet form of government, a dictatorship of the proletariat, abolition of property rights, or any other change in our political or social structure, provided he seeks to bring about the change by the parliamentary process of convincing the people that his political and economic philosophy is right.

But, having established a government with universal suffrage, and consequently the most perfect democracy on earth, we will not permit a military despotism in Russia, reimposed upon a people but recently relieved from bondage, to stir up insurrection among our alien residents, to whom we have extended hospitality and opened the doors of hope, even though their efforts in that direction are so futile that they cause us but slight annoyance.

The insulting intimation that profitable trade with Russia is so important in the American mind that we would permit our own institutions to be undermined and destroyed and our liberties submerged if we can but have access to that trade only reflects the brutal, materialistic conceptions of the dominant group in Russia. We have given several illustrations to the world, among them our entrance into the recent war, that while we love comfort we hate oppression and have a passion for human liberty.

For these reasons Congress has directed that every alien who is a member of an organization that proposes to use force to overthrow the United States shall be expelled. The traditional friendship between the American and Russian people will continue, and when a government exists in Russia that seeks to work out Russian destiny in the Russian way and leaves us to work out our destiny in our way, there will be no desire on the part of the American Government to deport its officers and members as such.

PRESIDENT WILSON'S LETTER TO THE LEAGUE

On November 26, 1920, President Wilson received by cable from President Hymans, of the Assembly of the League, a letter in which he was asked to undertake an effort to bring

peace between the Armenian Government and the Turkish Nationalist forces led by Kemal Pasha. He accepted the tender November 30, conditional upon assurances of the moral and diplomatic support of the principal powers. Incidentally, it may be remarked that prior to this correspondence Mr. Henry Morgenthau had been designated as the person who would be sent to the Near East to act for the United States, should the United States, under any plan of action, be committed to negotiations with Turkey and Russia.

No direct reply from the Allies coming, the President on January 18 sent a further communication to the League, which was made public January 22. The text follows:

WASHINGTON, January 18, 1921.

His Excellency PAUL HYMANS,
*President of the Assembly of the League of Nations,
Geneva, Switzerland:*

Your telegram of December 26, 1920, transmitting a message received by the Council from the British Government, concerning Armenia, stating that Armenia is reported to be under the control of Soviet Russia, and suggesting that the President instruct the American High Commissioner at Constantinople to take up the matter with the allied High Commissioners, has been received and read with interest by the President, who instructs me to reply as follows:

The President does not deem it practicable to instruct the American High Commissioner at Constantinople to act for him in this matter. As was stated in my telegram of December 16, 1920, he has chosen the Hon. Henry Morgenthau, who has been prepared to act for him in such steps as may be taken. Before instructing him to proceed, however, the President has been awaiting the definite assurances and information from all the principal powers interested, as requested in his cable of November 30, 1920, defining the conditions under which he would endeavor to mediate.

The message from the British Prime Minister transmitted by you on December 26 would seem to indicate the impracticability or futility of the President's addressing himself, at least in the first instance, to the Armenians and Kemalists. The President is inclined to share this view and to feel that no solution can be had without first getting at the source of the trouble.

Pending receipt of information and assurances requested by the President in his telegram of November 30, 1920, it is deemed wise to state the problem as the President views it, its causes and possible remedies. It would appear that the immediate cause of trouble in Armenia and Turkey has been the Treaty of Sèvres. Admittedly, this was a difficult question with which to contend, but the treaty was drafted by the allied powers, and the trouble has arisen over the failure of certain factions to accept this treaty and of the Allies to enforce it. This is a question over which the President has no control, and measures which he might take or recommend in this direction would be dependent upon the hearty co-operation and support of the allied powers.

The British Prime Minister calls attention to the report that Armenia is under the control of Moscow, from which it appears that another complication has developed. The dependence of Armenia on Soviet Russia is another situation over which the President has no control, and he sees no action he could take to free Armenia without the moral and diplomatic support of the principal powers which holds promise of bringing peace and accord to the contending parties.

Aspects of Russian Problems

There is bitter distrust and fear of war along all the Russian borders. It seems futile to attempt to bring peace to the Caucasus, if the result is merely to free the forces there engaged for new campaigns on other sectors of this long front. The distressful situation of Armenia is but one detail of this vast Russian problem, and the President most earnestly urges his conviction that it is only by a general and comprehensive treatment of the whole problem, only by full

and generous co-operation of the principal powers, that a hopeful approach to the pacification and independence of Armenia can be found.

The attitude of the President toward those now in power in Russia has been frequently and clearly expressed. He regards the Bolsheviks as a violent and tyrannical minority, by no means representing the real desires and purposes of the Russian people. But he had never believed that the problems raised by this coup d'état could be solved by military action from outside. He now hopes that the recent tragical events on the Polish front and in the Crimea have convinced all the world that armed invasion is not the way to bring peace to the people of Russia.

The rapidly shifting events of recent months have only strengthened his conviction that the Russian revolution, beneficent in its main purposes, must be developed to a satisfactory conclusion by the Russians themselves. Help may from time to time be given from outside and voluntarily received, but attempts at military coercion can but end in disaster.

There are elements in the present situation which give added hope to projects of pacification. All the world is weary of war, and the conviction grows among the peoples of all countries that the military method offers very little promise of solving the grave problems of reconstruction which face us. There is at present no overt civil war in Russia. It is now a problem of the relations between Central Russia and the surrounding smaller national groups.

The unrest and instability along the border are caused by bitter and mutual distrust. The struggling new nationalities, which were formerly part of the Russian Empire, are afraid to disarm and return to the works of peace because they distrust the Bolsheviks and fear new aggressions. The Soviets contend that they are afraid to demobilize because they fear new attacks.

The great impediment to peaceful reconstruction in those troubled border territories, the imminent danger of new hostilities, is caused by the utter confusion between offense and defense. Unless this distinction can be clearly defined, there is not only small hope of peace, but no hope of a clear perception of who is responsible for new wars.

It is, therefore, the thought of the President that the present moment offers a peculiarly pressing challenge to an attempt at general pacification on the Russian borders along these lines. Such an attempt seems to the President the logical outgrowth—in fact, the only logical development—of the request to mediate in the Armenian conflict, and he feels bound in conscience once more to call this matter to the attention of the associated nations.

General Action Necessary

It is obvious to all that these small struggling border States will not attack great Russia unless encouraged by promise of support from the stronger powers. The President therefore believes that the *sine qua non* of an attempt at pacification must be a public and solemn engagement among the great powers not to take advantage of Russia's stricken condition and not to violate the territorial integrity of Russia, nor to undertake themselves any further invasions of Russia, nor to tolerate such invasions by others.

Such a public agreement would in effect say to those now in power in Russia:

"You are not menaced from outside. The great powers have voluntarily guaranteed you from attack. You can have peace if you want it."

The responsibility for any new war which might break out on the Russian border would then be clearly placed.

If the principal powers represented on the Council of the League find themselves in accord with the President in this matter and will assure him of their moral and diplomatic support, he will instruct his personal representative, Mr. Morgenthau, to proceed at once on his mission.

NORMAN H. DAVIS.

On February 2 the State Department made public the following reply to the President's note:

Monsieur da Cunha, acting president of the Council of the League of Nations, requests me to forward to you the following telegram:

"Please thank President Wilson for his communication regarding Armenia received by Monsieur Hymans on January 22. I shall have the honor of submitting the views expressed therein for the consideration of the Council at its next meeting. The note has been brought to the knowledge of the representatives of the principal allied powers now meeting in Paris. The latter have announced that they will shortly hold a conference on questions relating to the Treaty of Sévres."

RUSSIA AND THE UNITED STATES

To a meeting of the National Civic Federation, held in New York on January 10, Acting Secretary of State Davis sent a communication in response to queries of that organization as to the policy of the United States toward Russia. He said:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
WASHINGTON, January 8, 1921.

HON. ALTON B. PARKER,

President National Civic Federation, 33d Floor, Metropolitan Tower, New York City, N. Y.

SIR: I have before me your letter of November 26, 1920, addressed to the Secretary of State, in which you call attention to certain criticisms of the Russian policy of the State Department made in a "widely published declaration," and in which you ask what ground there is, if any, for these statements and request specific answers to all of the points raised. I understand that the charges were made by the League of Free Nations Association in an open letter addressed to the presidential candidates on October 29 and widely published as an advertisement in the daily press, obviously in the hope of influencing the outcome of the election. Now that the votes have been cast and the results are known, I have no objection to replying specifically to the charges made in order to rectify the misapprehensions which this document suggests.

After a short introduction emphasizing the great importance of the Russian problem in the return to peace and the reconstruction problems that now face us, the letter propounds five questions. In form they start with certain statements of what is alleged to be the Russian policy of this administration and uniformly end up with the question, "If elected, will you support this policy?" This question is a specious method of presentation, as the truth or falsehood of the assertions made as to the existing policy toward Russia is of supreme importance.

The first paragraph of this questionnaire reads as follows:

"I. First. Our recent policy, although never clearly stated, has been to refuse to permit relief to be sent to that vast portion of Russia which is under the control of the Soviet Government. Thousands of Russians, Bolsheviks and non-Bolsheviks, are suffering from lack of medical supplies, soap, and the common necessities of life. No American has been officially permitted to feed a sick Russian child or to send medicine to a Russian hospital. If elected, will you support this policy?"

A False Charge

The first sentence of this paragraph is unqualifiedly false; the second sentence is true; the third sentence is somewhat ambiguous, but false in its obvious intention. Since the War Trade Board regulations in regard to trade with Russia were amended on July 8, 1920, it is not true that it has been our policy "to refuse to permit relief" to be sent to Soviet Russia. The only restriction maintained by this government on export trade with Soviet Russia is the restriction on the export of munitions or commodities susceptible of immediate military use. For the shipment of commodities under this qualification it is necessary to apply for special export license. There is no restriction on the export to Russia of "medical supplies, soap, and the common necessities of life." no special licenses are needed; none has been applied for.

That relatively little of these commodities has been sent is due to purely commercial considerations. Two different organizations have been carrying on a noisy agitation in this matter and asserting that they have been prevented by this government from sending medical supplies to Russia. They have been informed that no such obstacle exists to such shipments, but apparently they have no funds to send supplies or to pay for their transport.

The Department of State has taken an intense and continual interest in the possibility of arranging for large-scale relief work by strong and reputable organizations. The difficulties which have stood in the way of any accomplishments in this matter have been raised, not by this government but by the Soviets, who cannot find in their theory of communism any excuse for private philanthropy. Representatives of the large relief organizations, with the knowledge and approval of the Department of State, have visited the central Soviet authorities in Moscow in the hope of establishing a *modus vivendi* for such work, but with two exceptions have been met by rebuffs. In this matter the experience of this government has been identical with that of European countries, both those which were associated with us in the war and the northern neutrals. The only relief work which the Soviet will tolerate is the direct gift of supplies to the Soviet Government, to be distributed by them as their own largess. Quite aside from the question of whether this would be politically expedient, it is the opinion of almost all of those experienced in such work that it would be impossible to raise funds from private subscription on this basis.

Jews Undertook Relief

The two exceptions to this have been, first, the Jewish Joint Distribution Committee, which, contrary to the opinion of their colleagues, have felt that it was possible to extend relief in Soviet Russia on the conditions drawn up by the Soviet authorities; and, second, the American Friends Service Committee (Quakers), which has been operating almost continuously in Russia on a small scale under British management.

The State Department has taken the position that it could not officially encourage the entry into Soviet territory of American relief workers so long as the Soviet authorities continue to hold as hostages American citizens who are not accused of any illegal activity, but its attitude toward relief workers has been identical with that toward private business enterprises. Any American citizen who wishes to enter Russia on his own responsibility and without a passport can do so without any let or hindrance from this government. The "official" obstruction to feeding of sick Russian children by Americans has come not from this government, but from the Soviets.

The second paragraph reads as follows:

"Second. Under a recent ruling, the State Department confiscates the passports of American citizens traveling to and from Russia, nor are Americans officially permitted to communicate with Russia. An American of Russian descent cannot communicate unhindered with his mother in Russia; cannot ascertain whether his relatives are living or dead; cannot, if they are in distress, bring them to the United States; cannot himself go to their aid. If elected, will you support this policy?"

The first sentence deals with the question of passports. In conformity with the order lifting the War Trade Board restrictions against trade with Soviet Russia, it has been the policy of this department to issue passports to Americans wishing to enter Soviet Russia, good for the countries of transit. The authors of this paragraph seem to have had no idea of the nature of a passport. It is merely a formal and engraved adaptation of an official letter of introduction. It is addressed to a friendly government or governments, and it would not be proper or appropriate for this government to give a letter of introduction to the Soviet authorities.

Passports Are Returned

There is no possibility of normal passport courtesies between governments which are not in diplomatic relations.

A more recent order has instructed the diplomatic and consular officers in countries contiguous to Soviet Russia to take up the American passports of such Americans as wish to enter Soviet Russia, to be returned to them on their leaving Soviet territory, as the passports addressed to governments with which we have diplomatic relations could be of no legitimate use to them in Soviet territory, where they would have no sense and would offer no protection. No hardship is imposed on the Americans wishing to enter Russia at their own risk, and the chance of the misuse of American passports is notably decreased.

The second sentence of this paragraph involves much the same considerations. Postal communications are based on a commercial contract and imply solvency on both sides. Postal communications with Soviet Russia could not be formally established without treaty negotiations. That this government does not take such steps in order to facilitate postal communications cannot be justly construed as a refusal to permit communications. As a matter of fact, it is well known that letters do pass between the two territories.

An American of Russian descent wishing to communicate with his mother in Russia, while it is impossible for this government at present actually to help him, is not hindered nor interfered with by it.

It is true that he would probably experience great difficulty in bringing his relatives to the United States. Some of the difficulties might be raised by the immigration authorities of this country or by the Secretary of State in the discharge of the trust conferred upon him by the President to execute the so-called visé regulations, but past experience indicates that they would be small indeed compared to the difficulties raised by the Soviet authorities. There is the same attempt to mislead in the statement that he "cannot himself go to their aid." If he has the means to travel to the Soviet border and is admitted by the Soviet authorities, he will not be hindered by this government.

The third paragraph reads as follows:

"Third. The United States helped in every way to secure the independence of the oppressed Baltic nations of Lithuania, Latvia, and Esthonia, now republics. Secretary Colby's note of August 10 proposed officially to restore Russian 'territorial integrity,' and with it Russian rule over these countries. Hundreds of thousands of Americans of Baltic nationality are vitally interested in this proposal. If elected, will you support this policy?"

No Interference in Russia

The statement that this government "proposed officially to restore Russian 'territorial integrity' and with it Russian rule over these countries," is false. The last sentence, "Hundreds of thousands of Americans of Baltic nationality are vitally interested in this proposal," appears to have been intended either as a bribe or as a threat to the presidential candidates.

There is no intention on the part of this government "officially to restore" the former boundaries of the Russian Empire, nor to impose on any of the non-Russian territories the rule of the Great Russians. Russia today is in a condition of distress, and there is grave danger on all of her frontiers of aggression, either directly by foreign States or indirectly through the control of these border States. In several of these struggling border territories there is a difference of opinion as to which group has a right to speak for the "nationality" involved. It is the conviction of this government that these thorny questions cannot now be solved in an *ex parte* manner. The Russian people are certainly interested in such decisions, and, consistent with its previous action, the Department of State in the note of August 10 again served notice that it could not be considered as endorsing territorial settlements affecting the welfare of the Russian people unless a government generally recognized as representing them were a party to the adjustment.

The fourth paragraph reads as follows:

"Fourth. The United States has at various times helped armed intervention in Russia with money, men, and munitions. It is not now disclosed whether our government is at present doing so. Will you, if elected, make a plain dis-

closure of the commitments of the United States and a plain statement of what they involve?"

The first statement is true, but official announcement was made when the last of our troops was withdrawn from Russian territory, and this government is not at present participating in any armed action against Soviet Russia, nor is it supporting with money, men, or munitions any of the groups or parties which are in conflict with the Soviets. The insinuation in the last question that this government is secretly committed to intervention in Russia is gratuitous. It has no basis whatsoever in fact, and the implied charge that such commitments exist is refuted by the well-known policy of opposition to intervention maintained for months preceding the decision of the Supreme War Council to send troops to Russia, by our effort to reduce the joint intervention to the smallest scope, and to hold to specifically defined and limited purposes. The recently published exchange of notes between this government and Poland clearly expresses the policy of this government. This question is an indication of the spirit in which this questionnaire was drawn, which is not at all to discover the truth as to whether or not this government is secretly committed to such action, but so to phrase the question as to prejudge the replies.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

NORMAN H. DAVIS,
Acting Secretary.

THE UNITED STATES, INTERNATIONAL POLITICS, AND THE LEAGUE

Anglo-American relations have been subjected to "pin pricks" of late, and to such an extent that Ambassador Geddes left Washington for London on January 15 to advise with the British Ministry. He proceeded to Paris as soon as he crossed, and advised with the Supreme Council during its deliberations, from January 25 on to its adjournment. Later, in London, he conferred with Foreign Office and Cabinet officials, and about February 10 took passage for New York, having received explicit instructions on mooted issues, especially disarmament.

MR. HARDING ON ANGLO-AMERICAN FRIENDSHIP

On the 19th a letter from President-elect Harding was made public, which it will be important to keep in mind as affairs develop. The text follows:

JOHN A. STEWART, Esq.,
*The Sulgrave Institution, 3903 Woolworth Building,
New York City, N. Y.*

MARION, OHIO.

DEAR MR. STEWART: The labor of uniting into still closer amity and understanding the English-speaking peoples of the world has a significance of good to all Americans and to all nations and races of the world.

Destiny has made it a historical fact that the English-speaking peoples have been the instrument through which civilization has been flung to the far corners of the globe. I am impressed not so much by the glory that English-speaking peoples may take to themselves as by the profound duties that God has thrust upon them—duties of being restrained, tolerant and just. These duties will find their greatest recognition in a united, unshakeable friendship and understanding and oneness of purpose—not for the exclusion from brotherhood of others, but for a better brotherhood flowing toward others.

I believe that when the wisdom of America is summoned to assist the world in building a workable, as distinguished from a bungling, agreement or association for the prevention of war, unity of English-speaking peoples will play no small part, not to invade the rights or exclude the fellowship of other nations, but to protect and include them.

Faithfully yours,

WARREN G. HARDING.

THE UNITED STATES LEAVES AMBASSADORS' COUNCIL

Three agencies, since the signing of the Peace Treaty, have been functioning in interpreting the terms of the treaty and in enforcing the same—the Supreme Council of the Allied Powers, the Council of the League of Nations, and the Council of the Ambassadors. From the last of these the United States formally withdrew January 11, Ambassador Wallace explaining the action in the following terms:

The United States has participated in the meetings of the ambassadors principally for the purpose of dealing with questions relating to the armistice, and also in order to keep covenant with questions relating to treaties, pending action in the United States upon them.

In view of the fact that most of the important questions relating to the armistice have been disposed of, and inasmuch as the Treaty of Versailles has not been ratified by the United States, there appears to be no further occasion for continuing the American representation in the conference.

There is no hidden reason for my withdrawal. As is well known, my status has been that of an official representative, except in certain specific questions which have been handled by the conference, such as the negotiation and the signing of the treaty with Hungary. Now, after more than 100 meetings, after practically all the questions in which the United States was directly interested have been settled, it is meet and proper for America, since she has not ratified the treaty, to withdraw her representatives.

FRANCE, THE UNITED STATES, AND THE LEAGUE

Rene Viviani, one of the French delegation to the meeting of the League Assembly at Geneva, in his formal report on his mission, rendered January 19, said:

In several weeks we are going to see what official interpretation will be given to the pact on the other side of the Atlantic. We French are ready to take conciliatory steps in good consciences. It cannot be permitted that technicalities shall separate us from America. I refer to Article X. But I believe there is a more fundamental difference.

Article X is evidently dangerous for honest people, who wish no bluff in their relations with other nations. It was because of Article X that I opposed the admission of the Baltic States and Georgia to the League, because if these nations were attacked by the Bolsheviks we would not be in a position to give them aid. It may be in America that they fear the duty of sending armies to Europe. In given conditions we can well afford to review Article X.

But that is not the only point at issue. Even the existence of the covenant is threatened. Mr. Harding speaks of an association of nations. We speak of the League of Nations. Now, if it were only a question of words, it would not be important. But it is not merely a question of words.

There are two conceptions of the League. In the first conception the pact has been put at the head of treaties, not only preceding the articles of the treaties, but serving as a morai preface. There is an appeal to international honor, then there is the covenant, and then the articles of the treaties. The League is tied up to the treaties, so that if the League disappears many articles of the treaties disappear. What would become of the whole mandate system?

There is another conception. It is that which Argentina manifested at Geneva when she proposed nothing less than to destroy the pact. No one else agreed with her. This argument is that on one side there exists the treaty, whole in itself, and on the other hand the pact, which is something else. This is a conception which we cannot accept.

Be generous. What great work in the history of humanity has been achieved in one day? Do not despair of the League. It is absurd to say that the League has only to shake its finger to save the world from all ills. But wait. Let it grow. It will become, little by little, not the supergovernment we have heard about, not a superparliament, but a great moral arbiter.